UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,370	11/26/2003	John N. Gross	JNG 98001C	8022

23694   7590   12/30/2009
Law Office of J. Nicholas Gross, Prof. Corp.
2030 ADDISON ST.
SUITE 610
BERKELEY, CA 94704

EXAMINER
SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jngross@pacbell.net
anthonygreek@gmail.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 November 2009</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>83-103</u> is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>83-103</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 November 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1.   This office action is in response to request for continued examination

filed 11/18/09. Claims 83-103 are currently pending and have been

examined.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including

the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final

rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under

37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely

paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant

to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/21/09 has been

entered.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 10/21/09, with respect the 35 USC 102

rejections as anticipated by Bradshaw (US 5,835,722) have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, regarding claims 83, 84, 87, 92, 94, 96,100 and

101 are patentable over Bradshaw (se pages 11-12). "Thus claim 83 has

been amended to read that the language filter is for "...checking words

within the email message file..." and that inspecting/alerting steps are done

on words within such email message file as well. In Bradshaw the only

"filtering" of the author's creation of content is done at the keyboard queue

level, so it cannot meet this language of the claims. See below, where the

dashed arrow (added by the applicant to illuminate the present discussion)

shows that the only entity being examined by Bradshaw are individual

entries as found in a separate XSTOP keyboard queue:

In other words, Bradshaw is not inspecting or filtering the contents of

an email message file; he is merely intercepting characters before they

become part of such file. This is confirmed at, among other places, col. 8,

II. 24+ and I. 49: "...X-Stop converts the X-Stop keyboard queue to upper-

case, and initiates a comparison of the word, i.e., the character string in the

queue, with the data in the Libraries..." The other mechanism for adding

content, namely the clipboard sentinel module, operates in substantially the

same fashion: see col. 10, II. 15- 33. The data it examines is only part of a

temporary queue."

However, the Examiner cannot concur with the applicant's

assessment of Bradshaw, wherein Bradshaw teaches an electronic

message file, C.7 lines 8-17-his E-mail log of messages, wherein the

message file is reviewed by a supervisor/user, and further being reviewed

for inappropriate content, in the manner disclosed/claimed by applicant,

C.12 lines 45-52-his sentinels expanded to compare content of incoming

and outgoing E-mail with the libraries. Thus, Bradshaw teaches checking

"words within the e-mail message file." Therefore, applicant's

corresponding arguments remain unpersuasive.

Applicant further argues, p.13, "The other significant difference is this:

the Examiner states that the Supervisor can usurp the X-Stop monitor and

bypass the controls to still send an email message. This is not completely

accurate." However, the Examiner cannot concur, wherein as explained in

the previous office action, "C.2 lines 57-67-screen production of email, C.3

lines 10-34, C.4 lines 18-21, Bradshaw explicitly teaches giving screening

of content of a user, libraries, and content for sending by a user, the

Examiner notes that the actual blocking mechanism that prevents the mail

from being sent is known by a supervisor, in the form of a password, C.8

lines 59-61, however, the Examiner notes a user can be a supervisor, C.5

lines 32-34, explicitly detail the supervisor as "anyone who has authority to

control the user of the computer system in which X-Stop is installed." Thus,

there is nothing to prevent a Supervisor from creating a message, and

having the message dynamically scanned and prompted for vulgar

language, blocked from transmission, entering the password, (editing or not

the content) and sending the message through his email application, as X-

stop is running on the application." Despite applicant's contention that the

message cannot be screened and sent, the Examiner has provided

evidence to the contrary such that the Supervisor has the capability and

authority to have a message scanned for inappropriate content (see above

email scanning discussion), and send the email by regardless of content

(by bypassing the XSTOP, i.e. closing the X-Stop Monitor, C.9 lines 1-31),

wherein the file is not lost, destroyed, and unable to be sent, or completed,

the file is scanned as discussed above, inappropriate content is

determined, yet the message is unblocked, and sent. Thus applicant's

arguments remain unpersuasive.

Applicant further argues, "Finally, as noted by the Applicant,

Bradshaw does not show "selecting" a language filter." However, the

Examiner cannot concur. Bradshaw explicitly teaches, C.3 lines 30-47- a

supervisor adding the language filters (libraries), see also C.7 lines 18-35-

which explicitly discuss the selection of libraries for filtering, thus the

supervisor has the ability to select which language filters and words being applied. Furthermore, in the event of a single library, one still has the ability to select "that" library. Thus applicant's above arguments remain unpersuasive.

Applicants arguments regarding claims 84, 87 and 92, and independent claims 94, 96, 100 and 101, which incorporate and are based on the above arguments, are thus also deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant further argues, "Claims 88, 89 and 97 are patentable over Bradshaw in view of Stamps These claims should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 83, from which they depend. Moreover, claim 89 recites that the language filter has foreign words; the Stamps reference merely explains that the spell checking dictionary may be of a different language. Since Stamps neither teaches nor suggests that it can be used as a foreign language filter, Applicant submits that this very real deficiency as a reference makes its value marginal in combination with Bradshaw. It is not a language "filter" as set out in the claims, and combining it with Bradshaw would not therefore result in the invention of claim 89."

However the Examiner has addressed these arguments previously, and the Examiner's response is repeated herein. The Examiner notes this

is an attack on Stamp individually, and **omits the offensive language filter and library with an initial language, editable by the supervisor as taught by Bradshaw in the arguments**. Furthermore, omits the discussion and motivation to combine Stamps with Bradshaw which consequently **produces a second language dictionary with offensive words**, see Stamps C.3 lines 31-44-his various language dictionaries, which second dictionary is part of a second electronic file which is separate from a first electronic file used for said first set of words and can be considered separately from said first electronic file (ibid, his each dictionary). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Bradshaw's email message (document) with spell checking and language filter for foreign language words. The motivation for doing so would have been to have correct spelling and improper foreign language words. Therefore, applicants above arguments remain unpersuasive.

Applicant further argues, "Claims 90, 91,93, 98 and 99 are patentable over Bradshaw and Russell – Falla." However these arguments are based on the above arguments regarding claim 83 and repeated threshold argument, and thus the arguments remain unpersuasive, wherein as

previously stated, the Examiner relies on Russell-Falla for teaching wherein an author is alerted only if a sensitivity threshold specified by the author is exceeded (C.5.1ines 34-51-his threshold value set, abstract). In the cited section, Russell-Falla explicitly teaches, "threshold values are used to influence the decision of whether or not a particular digital dataset should be deemed to contain the selected category of information content. Thus, anyone ordinarily skilled in the art, would have the knowledge of a threshold as applicable to a particular dataset, and thus as combined with Bradshaw, teach applicants claimed invention. Therefore, applicant's arguments, regarding the "thresholds" remain unpersuasive.

Regarding claims 93 and dependent claims 98 and 99, the applicant's arguments are based on the arguments provided for claim 83 and the above Russel-Falla arguments, and thus are also deemed unpersuasive.

Applicant further argues, " Claims 95 and 102 - 103 are patentable over Bradshaw taken with Rayson Independent claim 95 should be allowable for the same reasons as claim 83 previously discussed. Moreover as noted earlier as well, Applicant disagrees with the argument that one skilled in the art would reasonably combine Rayson with Bradshaw."

However, the Examiner has previously cited, the combination

provides an option to Bradshaw which allows the system to automatically

scan an entry either immediately as input or after an idle period, for

correction (ibid, Rayson-C.3 lines 24-30, abstract and summary). Thus

applicant's arguments remain unpersuasive.

Independent claims 102 and 100, are based on above previously

addressed unpersuasive arguments and thus are deemed unpersuasive as

well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in

this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 83, 84, 87, 92, 94, 96, 100 and 101are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bradshaw (US 5,835,722).

As per **claim 83**, Bradshaw teaches a method of permitting an author

of an electronic mail (email) message file to check text content of such file

using an electronic text editor program operating on a computing system,

the method comprising:

(a) permitting the author to select at least one language filter (C.3

lines 30-47- a supervisor adding the language filters (libraries), thus the

supervisor has the ability to select which language filters and words being

applied, see below discussion of supervisor taken as the author/user) for

checking words within in the email message file (C.7 lines 18-26-his foul

language filter, C.7 lines 8-17-his E-mail log of messages, wherein the

message file is reviewed by a supervisor/user, and further being reviewed

for inappropriate content, in the manner disclosed/claimed by applicant,

C.12 lines 45-52-his sentinels expanded to compare content of incoming

and outgoing E-mail with the libraries. Thus, Bradshaw teaches checking

words within the e-mail message file"), which language filter includes a

first set of words identified as offensive and/or potentially inappropriate for

use in connection with an intended recipient of the email message (ibid,

his library of foul language); and

(b) receiving input words entered by the author as text for the email

message file (ibid, C.8 lines 35-37-his author typing the words);

(c) inspecting said input words within the email message file to determine if they fall within said language filter (ibid, C.8 lines 35-40-his inspection of the words and comparison to his libraries);

(d) alerting the author when one or more of said input words within the email message file fall within said language filter (ibid, C.8 lines 54-58, his blocking screen);

(e) permitting the author to change words within the email message file after step (d) and before the email message file is transmitted to said intended recipient (ibid, C.8 lines 55-59-his typed password, thus allowing access to the email, at this point there is no transmission, and C.4 lines 25-28-his text editor, wherein it is inherent that the author with access in a text editor, can make changes); and

wherein the author of the email message file can cause the email message file be transmitted by the computing system to said intended recipient even if the words in such email message file still fall within said language filter (ibid, C.2 lines 57-67-screen production of email, C.3 lines 10-34, C.4 lines 18-21, Bradshaw explicitly teaches giving screening of content of a user, libraries, and content for sending by a user, the Examiner notes that the actual blocking mechanism that prevents the mail from being

sent is known by a supervisor, in the form of a password, C.8 lines 59-61,

however, the Examiner notes a user can be a supervisor, C.5 lines 32-34,

explicitly detail the supervisor as "anyone who has authority to control the

user of the computer system in which X-Stop is installed." Thus, there is

nothing to prevent a Supervisor from creating a message, and having the

message dynamically scanned and prompted for vulgar language, blocked

from transmission, entering the password, (editing or not the content) and

sending the message through his email application, as X-stop is running on

the application.

As per **claim 84**, Bradshaw teaches claim 83. Bradshaw further

teaches wherein said language filter includes obscene, vulgar and/or racist

words found in a first pre-programmed dictionary created without input from

the author (C.3 lines 30, 31-library, C.6 lines 9-14-his third library, see Fig.

2-his stored library).

As per **claim 87**, Bradshaw teaches claim 83. Bradshaw further

teaches a step (f): checking one or more additional electronic message files

according to steps (a) through (d) (C.2 lines 61-67-his documents, C.5 lines

35-40-his transmission of the any messages/data).

As per **claim 92**, Bradshaw teaches claim 83. Bradshaw further

teaches wherein steps (a) through (e) are implemented as a software

routine in a machine readable form executable by a personal computer

(Bradshaw, C.5.lines 3-25).

As per **claims 94, 100 and 101**, claims 94, 100 and 101, set forth

limitations similar to claim 83, and are thus rejected for the same reasons

and under the same rationale.

Bradshaw further teaches inspecting said input word substantially

immediate in time after it is entered to determine if it falls within said

language filter, and wherein said input word is checked before the author

has entered another input word (C.8 lines 35-60-as the user types, X-Stop

monitors and checks the content of each character, claims 94, 100 and

101).

As per **claim 96**, Bradshaw teaches a computer program for checking

text content of an email message file using an electronic text editor

program operating on a computing system (C.5 lines 25, 26-his software),

comprising:

a language filter for checking words within the email message file

(C.7 lines 18-26-his foul language filter, C.7 lines 8-17-his E-mail log of

messages, wherein the message file is reviewed by a supervisor/user, and

further being reviewed for inappropriate content, in the manner

disclosed/claimed by applicant, C.12 lines 45-52-his sentinels expanded to

compare content of incoming and outgoing E-mail with the libraries. Thus,

Bradshaw teaches checking **"words within the e-mail message file"**),

which language filter is an electronic dictionary which includes a set of

words that could be offensive and/or potentially inappropriate for use in

connection with an intended recipient of the email message file (ibid, his

library of foul language); and a content checking routine which is adapted

for:

i) receiving input words entered by the author as text for the email

message file (ibid, C.8 lines 35-37-his author typing the words);

ii) inspecting said input words within the email message file to

determine if they fall within said language filter (ibid, C.8 lines 35-40-his

inspection of the words and comparison to his libraries);

iii) generating an alert to the author when ea one or more of said

input words within the email message file fall within said language filter

(ibid, C.8 lines 54-58, his blocking screen);

iv) permitting the author to change words within the email message

file after an alert is generated and before the email message file is

transmitted to said intended recipient (ibid, C.8 lines 55-59-his typed

password, thus allowing access to the email, at this point there is no

transmission , and C.4 lines 25-28-his text editor, wherein it is inherent that

the author with access in a text editor, can make changes); and

wherein the author of the email message file can cause the email

message file to be transmitted by the computing system to said intended

recipient even if words in such email message file still fall within said

language filter (ibid, C.2 lines 57-67-screen production of email, C.3 lines

10-34, C.4 lines 18-21, Bradshaw explicitly teaches giving screening of

content of a user, libraries, and content for sending by a user, the Examiner

notes that the actual blocking mechanism that prevents the mail from being

sent is known by a supervisor, in the form of a password, C.8 lines 59-61,

however, the Examiner notes a user can be a supervisor, C.5 lines 32-34,

explicitly detail the supervisor as "anyone who has authority to control the

user of the computer system in which X-Stop is installed." Thus, there is

nothing to prevent a Supervisor from creating a message, and having the

message dynamically scanned and prompted for vulgar language, blocked

from transmission, entering the password, (editing or not the content) and

sending the message through his email application, as X-stop is running on

the application).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.　　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the

basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.　　Claims 85 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Bradshaw et al. (Bradshaw, US 5,835,722) in view of

Cohen (US 5,796,948).

　　　　As per **claim 85**, Bradshaw teaches the method of claim 83, but lacks

providing a highlighting of any words which are determined to fall within

said language filter along with an accompanying visual warning. However,

Cohen teaches providing a highlighting of any words which are determined

to fall within said language filter along with an accompanying visual warning

(C.4.lines 30-50-his bracketing of each profanity, and profanity message

displayed to the user). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have

been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Bradshaw's

warning display with Cohen's highlighting of words, providing the benefit of identifying words falling within the language filter.

As per **claim 86**, Bradshaw teaches claim 83. Bradshaw further teaches a plurality of language filters (C.3 lines 30-47-his created libraries, and Fig. 2-his Libraries Loaded in Memory).

Bradshaw lacks explicitly teaching identifying which ones of a plurality of language filter were triggered to the author during step (d). However, Cohen teaches identifying a language filter to the author which was triggered during step (d) (C.4.lines 36-38-his profanity message). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art to modify Bradshaw with Cohen's profanity message, providing the benefit of identifying the triggered language filters.

8.   Claims 88, 89 and 97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bradshaw, as applied to claim 83 above, and further in view of Stamps et al. (Stamps, US 5,437,036).

As per **claims 88 and 89**, Bradshaw teaches claim 83, but lacks including a step (f): checking spelling of the email message, and further lack wherein said language filter includes a second dictionary with foreign language words.

However, Stamps teaches checking spelling (C.3.lines 17-30-his spell checking), and a dictionary with foreign language words (C.3 lines 31-44-his various language dictionaries), which second dictionary is part of a second electronic file which is separate from a first electronic file used for said first set of words and can be considered separately from said first electronic file (ibid, his each dictionary). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Bradshaw's email message (document) with spell checking and language filter for foreign language words. The motivation for doing so would have been to have correct spelling and improper foreign language words.

As per **claim 97**, Bradshaw teaches claim 96, and further teaches wherein said language filter includes at least a first dictionary and a second separate dictionary (Fig. 2 his libraries), but lacks said alert includes an indication of which of said first dictionary or said second dictionary was triggered by said alert.

However, Stamps teaches said language filter includes at least a first dictionary and a second separate dictionary, and said alert includes an indication of which of said first dictionary or said second dictionary was triggered by said alert (C.3 lines 31-44-his various language dictionaries,

C.4 lines 5-16 and C.5 lines 63-67-his specified dictionaries). Therefore, at

the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Bradshaw's

libraries dictionary with two independent dictionaries. The motivation for

doing so would have been identify the dictionary for the correction (Stamps,

ibid).

9.   Claims 90, 91, 93, 98 and 99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Bradshaw, as applied to claim 83 above, and

further in view of Russell-Falla et al. (Russell-Falla, US 6,675,162).

      As per **claims 90 and 91**, Bradshaw teaches claim 83, but lacks

teaching wherein an author is alerted during step (d) only if a sensitivity

threshold specified by the author is exceeded, and wherein said sensitivity

threshold is specified as a numerical value ranging from 1 to 10.

      However, Russell-Falla teaches wherein an author is alerted only if a

sensitivity threshold specified by the author is exceeded (C.5.lines 34-51,

abstract). The Examiner takes Official notice that a sensitivity threshold can

have a range of numerical values. Therefore, at the time of the invention, it

would have been obvious to modify Bradshaw's language filter with a

threshold specified by an author, wherein the threshold has a range (such

as 1-10). The motivation for doing so would have to allow user designate a

threshold to filter content (Russel-Falla, abstract).

As per **claims 93 and 98**, claims 93 and 98 set forth limitations

similar to claim 83 and 91, and are thus rejected for the same reasons and

under the same rationale.

As per **claim 99**, Bradshaw and Russell-Falla make obvious claim 98,

Russell-Falla also teaches wherein said sensitivity threshold is used during

a check of individual words in said language filter (C.5.lines 65-67,

abstract-his email).

10.   Claims 95, and 102, and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Bradshaw in view of Rayson et al. (Rayson, US

5,761,689).

As per **claims 95, 102, and 103**, claims 95, and 102, set forth

limitations similar to claim 83, and are thus rejected for the same reasons

and under the same rationale.

Bradshaw lacks inspecting said input words during idle periods when

the author is not interacting with said electronic text editor program to

determine if such input words fall within said language filter and said inut

words are also checked for spelling during said idle periods (claims 95, 102

and 103).

However, Rayson teaches inspecting said input words during idle periods when the author is not interacting with said electronic text editor program (C.2.lines 12-24-his automatic as immediate and delimiting as before the user enters another word, C.3.lines 24-31-as his spell check, and language filtered as misspellings are interpreted as inappropriate for use in connection with an intended recipient of an email message-claims 102, 103). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Bradshaw's language filter with after an idle period scan of the words to be filtered. The motivation for doing so would have been to automatically scan an entry either immediately as input or after an idle period, for correction (ibid, Rayson-C.3 lines 24-30, abstract and summary).

Conclusion

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAMONT M. SPOONER whose telephone number is (571)272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on 571/272-7843.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David R Hudspeth/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

lms
12/18/09